



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/648,767	08/28/2000	Alan F. Graves	85773-323	5709

7590 09/30/2003
Smart & Biggar
1000 de la Gauchetiere Street West
Suite 3400
Montreal, H3B4W5
CANADA

EXAMINER

PAYNE, DAVID C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2633

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/648,767

Applicant(s)

GRAVES, ALAN F.

Examiner

David C. Payne

Art Unit

2633

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 August 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 21 and 44-48 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20, 22-26, 29-43, and 49-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 27 and 28 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 August 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2633

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
2. Claim(s) 1-20, 39-43, 49, 50-52, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petsko et al. US006292516B1 (Petsko) in view of Harris US005200979A (Harris).

Re claim(s) 1, 11, 8, 12, 18, 39, 43, 49, 54

Petsko disclosed

A communications signal embodied in a transmission medium and for use in a communications network, comprising: recurrent wrapper bursts, each wrapper burst comprising one or more wrapper symbols (e.g., col./line: 4/1-10), each of which corresponds to an information bit;

Petsko does not disclose wherein each wrapper symbol is characterized by a signal level transition pattern, said signal level transition pattern being either a first pattern or a second pattern depending on the logic value of the respective information bit; and wherein the first and second patterns each have a distinct average signal level and are each characterized by at least one signal level transition. Harris disclosed that signals have a dc balance component based upon symbol transition. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that a every binary word has a distinct average signal level since the a binary symbol has bit transitions and therefore creates a dc bias based upon the time the it is off, (see Harris col./line: 1/40-50). Furthermore, the dc signal level disclosed in Harris is a self-evident fact that a binary symbol necessarily has a average dc value since every bit either contributes to the average value if the logic level is greater than zero or does not if the bit value is equal to zero.

Art Unit: 2633

Re claim(s) 2, 40-42,

In the modified invention to Petsko and Harris, Harris disclosed wherein the first and second patterns each have a plurality of signal level transitions which are sufficiently densely spaced in time to enable far-end receiver synchronization (see Harris col./line: 6/40-50).

Re claim(s) 3, 4, 13, 14, 20, 50-52

In the modified invention to Petsko and Harris, Harris does not disclose wherein the first and second patterns each have at least one rising edge and at least one falling edge. However, Harris disclosed that synchronization is possible at the receiver. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that bit transitions need occur for synchronization to be possible at the receiver and therefore complementary to reduce dc bias.

Re claim(s) 5, 6, 15, 16

In the modified invention to Petsko and Harris, Harris wherein the first pattern has multiple substantially evenly distributed pulses (Harris, figure 4 #40).

Re claim(s) 7, 10, 17

In the modified invention to Petsko and Harris, Harris further comprising a payload segment between each adjacent pair of wrapper bursts, wherein each wrapper burst has a duration substantially less than the duration of either adjacent payload segment. (Harris, figure 3)

Re claim(s) 9, 19

In the modified invention to Petsko and Harris disclosed being an electrical signal (figure 6).

Art Unit: 2633

3. Claim(s) 22-26, 29, and 30-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petsko et al. US006292516B1 (Petsko) and Harris US005200979A (Harris) in view of Nakamura et al. US005857092A (Nakamura).

Re claim 22-24, 32, 38

Petsko disclosed,

A communications signal embodied in a transmission medium and for use in a communications network, comprising: recurrent wrapper bursts, each wrapper burst comprising one or more wrapper symbols (e.g., col./line: 4/1-10), each of which corresponds to an information bit;

Petsko does not disclose wherein each wrapper symbol is characterized by a signal level transition pattern, said signal level transition pattern being either a first pattern or a second pattern depending on the logic value of the respective information bit; and wherein the first and second patterns each have a distinct average signal level and are each characterized by at least one signal level

transition. Harris disclosed that signals have a dc balance component based upon symbol transition. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that a every binary word has a distinct average signal level since the a binary symbol has bit transitions and therefore creates a dc bias based upon the time the it is off, (see Harris col./line:

1/40-50). Petsko dose not disclose the method comprising the steps of: converting the composite optical signal into an electrical signal having an electrical bandwidth that is substantially less than the bandwidth of the high-speed data stream; locating the position of each wrapper segment in the low-bandwidth electrical signal; and detecting individual bits of the overhead bit stream from the average level of the low-bandwidth electrical signal during the located wrapper segments.

Nakamura disclosed optical/electrical conversion and detecting individual bits of the overhead bit stream from the average level of the low-bandwidth electrical signal during the located wrapper segments (figure 8, #153). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to apply the wrapper symbol technology to the optical domain for the benefit of high speed transport.

Art Unit: 2633

Re claim(s) 25, 26, 29, 30, 34, 36

Harris disclosed, wherein the step of detecting comprises: for each wrapper symbol interval in each located wrapper segment, measuring an average signal level of the lowbandwidth electrical signal during that wrapper symbol interval; comparing the measured average signal level to a threshold; and if the measured average signal level is above the threshold, concluding that the corresponding bit in the overhead bit stream is a logic "one" and if the measured average signal level is below the threshold, concluding that the corresponding bit in the overhead bit stream is a logic zero (e.g., col./line: 1/40-60).

Re claim(s) 31, 35

Petsko does not disclose each wrapper symbol is characterized by at least one intermediate signal level transition.

However, Harris disclosed that synchronization is possible at the receiver. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that bit transitions need occur for synchronization to be possible at the receiver and therefore complementary to reduce dc bias. (see Harris col./line: 1/40-50).

Re claim(s) 33, 37

In the modified invention to Petsko and Harris, Harris disclosed wherein the receiver has a bandwidth which is significantly less than the bit rate of the high-speed data stream. (Harris figure 3).

4. Claim(s) 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petsko et al.

US006292516B1 (Petsko) and Harris US005200979A (Harris) as applied to claim 49 above, and further in view of Kolze et al. US006285681B1 (Kolze).

Art Unit: 2633

Re claim(s) 53

The modified invention of Petsko and Harris does not disclose Forward Error Correction (FEC).

However, Kolze disclose FEC (figure 1 #16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to add FEC to the aforementioned invention for the benefit of optimizing data transmission under various conditions of channel quality and interference based upon the Kolze disclosure (e.g., col./line: 1/35-40).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 21 and 44-48 are allowed.
6. Claims 27 and 28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David C. Payne whose telephone number is (703) 306-0004. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7a-4p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on (703) 305-4729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Dcp


JASON CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600